

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD TO OFFERORS

M.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

NOTICE: The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1)

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
None included by reference		

II. NASA FAR SUPPLEMENT (48 CFR CHAPTER 18) PROVISIONS

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
None included by reference		

(End of provision)

1.0 GENERAL

The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated by a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the FAR and the NASA FAR Supplement. The SEB will carry out the evaluation activities and report its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA), who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

2.0 FAR 52-217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined by FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of provision)

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

3.0 SOURCE EVALUATION FACTORS

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price. A brief description of each of these factors is set forth below. Only the Mission Suitability factor will be weighed and scored. The Government's intent regarding discussions with Offerors in the competitive range is set forth in provision 52.215-1, Instructions To Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions (JAN 2004) (Alternate I) (OCT 1997) in Section L.

Volume No.	Title	Evaluation Factor	Evaluation Subfactor
Volume I	Technical and Management Approach		
	TA. Technical Approach		
	TA1. Overall Technical Approach	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	TA: Technical Approach
	TA2. Specific Technical Understanding and Associated Resources	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	TA: Technical Approach
	TA3. Operational Scenario	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	TA: Technical Approach
	MA. Management Approach		
	MA1. Overall Management Approach	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
	MA2. Key Personnel (Att. L-1 resumes not included in page limit)	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
	SA. Safety and Health Approach		
	SA1. Safety and Health Plan	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	SA: Safety and Health Approach
Volume II	Plans		
	A. Annual Performance Feedback Plan	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	TA: Tech and MA: Mgmt. Approach
	B. Phase-in/Transition Plan	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
	C. Total Compensation Plan	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
	D. Associate Contracting Agreements	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
	E. IT Management and Security Plans	M.4.0.1	TA: Tech and

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

		Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
--	--	---------------------	--------------------

Volume No.	Title	Evaluation Factor	Evaluation Subfactor
Volume II	Plans (Continued)		
	F. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan	M.4.0.1 Mission Suitability	MA: Mgmt. Approach
Volume III	Past Performance	M.6 Past Performance	-----
Volume IV	Price Proposal	M.7 Price	-----
Volume V	Other Required Data		
	A. Ostensible Subcontractor Approach	M.8 Ostensible Subcontractor Approach	-----
	B. Model Contract Offerors shall also submit three (3) original executed model contracts, Sections A-J, with all fill-ins completed (those fill-ins required to be completed by the Offeror) and a completed Section K Representations and Certifications`	-----	-----

4.0 **VOLUME 1 – TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT APPROACH**

4.0.1 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability factor and associated subfactors are used to assess the merit of the work or product proposed and the ability of the Offeror to actually provide what is offered. Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based on the subfactors set forth below.

4.0.2 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SUBFACTORS

The Mission Suitability subfactors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below. These weights will be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

<u>Subfactor</u>	<u>Points</u>
A: Technical Approach (TA)	500
B: Management Approach (MA)	400
C: Safety and Health Approach (SA)	<u>100</u>
TOTAL	1000

4.1 MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTORS

TA Subfactor A: Technical Approach

TA1. Overall Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness, soundness, efficiency, and innovative approaches of the Offeror's overall technical rationale and approach to accomplishing Statement of Work requirements. For technical activities that apply contract wide, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of ensuring the technical integration of the key SOW functional areas and the contractor's approach for ensuring technical integration among key areas both within the Program Integration and Control (PI&C) follow-on contract and with other ISS Program Contractors and International Partners.

TA2. Specific Technical Understanding and Associated Resources

- a. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical understanding of Statement of Work Requirements for PI&C including the processes and plans for interfacing with other ISS Program Contractors. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the offeror's proposed IT tools for accomplishing PI&C requirements, including any required demonstrations. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness, soundness, efficiency, and innovative methods of the Offeror's approach to identifying, monitoring, and controlling price, schedule, and technical risks for PI&C requirements.
- b. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness, soundness, efficiency, and innovative approaches of the Offeror's proposed labor resources **for the first year of the proposed contract**, (skill mix and staffing levels identified in the Tables of Resources) for accomplishing PI&C requirements including the qualifications and experience levels of personnel. The Government will evaluate the basis of estimate and

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

supporting rationale for the proposed labor resources **for the first year of the proposed contract. Additionally the Government will identify risks and the potential for cost impact shall be considered in the cost or price evaluation.**

c. The Government will evaluate proposed efficiencies and cost savings.

TA3. Operational Scenario

The Government will evaluate the response to the Operational Scenario for demonstration of the offeror's understanding of the SOW requirements, process flexibility, and necessary technical capabilities. The Government will evaluate associated impacts to SOW functions, recommended courses of action, contractual implications if any, and approach to identifying price, schedule, and risk impacts to on-going operations.

MA Subfactor B: Management Approach

MA1. OVERALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH:

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness, soundness, efficiency, and innovative method of the Offeror's overall management approach to PI&C contract requirements for the following areas:

- a. **ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to demonstrate and ensure success in executing the PI&C SOW requirements (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.A).
- b. **TEAMING ARRANGEMENTS:** The Government will evaluate the teaming arrangements, communication channels, lines of authority, reporting relationships, and responsibilities of any proposed subcontractors, team members, or joint venture partners (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.B).
- c. **WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (WBS):** The Government will evaluate the proposed work breakdown structure (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.C).
- d. **ATTRACTING AND RETAINING PERSONNEL:** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal to assess their approach to attract and retain qualified personnel (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.D).
- e. **GOVERNMENT INTERFACE AND COMMUNICATION:** The Government will evaluate the offeror's interface with the Government in the management and communication of SOW tasks and priorities. The Government will evaluate the approach to management of the SOW

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

requirements and contract schedules and deliverables; as well as the approach for communicating and obtaining customer concurrence with changing priorities and workforce adjustments (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.E).

- f. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach for ensuring customer satisfaction (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.F).
- g. EXPORT CONTROL: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's understanding of compliance with export control regulations (reference Section L, 4.0, MA1.G).

MA2. KEY PERSONNEL:

The Government will evaluate the experience, past performance, education, overall capability and commitment of key personnel. The Government will evaluate the minimum qualifications standards proposed to be used to replace key personnel and how the offeror will ensure key personnel will maintain the minimum qualification standards.

SA Subfactor C: Safety and Health Approach

SA1. SAFETY AND HEALTH PLAN:

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness and compliance of the Offeror's proposed Safety and Health Plan with the requirements contained in DRD PIC-SA-02.

- 5.0 VOLUME II – PLANS** - The Government will evaluate the effectiveness, soundness, efficiency, and innovative method of the Offeror's overall management approach to PI&C contract requirements.

The following plan will be evaluated under the Technical Approach and Management Approach subfactor:

- A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PLAN - The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed Annual Performance Feedback Plan to adequately define the objective measures and standards of excellence in performing the SOW requirement.

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

The following plans will be evaluated under the Management Approach subfactor:

- B. PHASE-IN and TRANSITION PLAN - The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Phase-in and Transition Plan for accomplishing a smooth phase-in without compromising effective and efficient operations of the work performed under the current contracts.
- C. TOTAL COMPENSATION PLAN (TCP) - The Government will evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed Total Compensation Plan.
- D. ASSOCIATE CONTRACTOR AGREEMENTS (ACAs) - The Government will evaluate the overall completeness, soundness, and effectiveness of the proposed approach to establishing and implementing ACAs.

The following plan will be evaluated under the Technical Approach and Management Approach subfactor:

E. IT MANAGEMENT AND SECURITY PLANS

- 1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach for coordinating and executing all technical and administrative tasks for all activities required to manage ISS Program IT resources and interfaces with other ISS Program and institutional IT providers.
- 2. The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach for establishing and maintaining IT Security requirements. The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding of IT Security requirements, and the application of those requirements in the ISS Program IT operational environment, as well as the Offeror's familiarity with the Certification and Accreditation (C&A) process for ISS Program IT systems. The Government will evaluate the IT Security Plan for any proposed offsite Offeror-managed facility.
- 3. The government will evaluate the proposed life cycle methodology that encompasses all life cycle phases for IT systems and applications. The proposed methodology shall enable the provisioning of IT systems with the best performance and quality in a cost effective manner.

The following plan will be evaluated under the Management Approach subfactor:

- F. ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST AVOIDANCE PLAN - The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan.

6.0 VOLUME III PAST PERFORMANCE

Past performance indicates how well an Offeror performed on earlier work and can be an indicator of how well it can be expected to perform future work.

The Offeror's past performance, including relevant experience, will be evaluated separately by the SEB in accordance with FAR 15.305 and NFS 1815.305(a), but will not be numerically weighed or scored. The evaluation will be based on information provided by Offerors in their proposals, as well as any other information obtained independently by the SEB. In accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. The results of the Board's evaluation will be presented to the SSA for his/her consideration.

7.0 VOLUME IV PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Government will perform price analysis and may also perform cost analysis where appropriate in accordance with FAR 15.305, FAR 15.404, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305.

The Government will analyze the proposed fully burdened IDIQ Fixed Price rates. The Government will evaluate the total price as follows:

Year 1: The total evaluated price in year 1 will be the sum of the products of the proposed rates and proposed hours in the Summary Price Template (SPT) (Template #2).

Year 2 through 5: The total evaluated price per year will be the sum of the products of the proposed rates and the Government provided hours in the Summary Price Template (SPT) (Template #2). .

The total evaluated price will be the sum of the evaluated price for years 1 through 5. Additionally, the Government will identify risks and the potential for cost impact shall be considered in the cost or price evaluation. The realism of resources proposed in the Offerors' Technical and Management Approach may also be used in identifying risks for which the Government may evaluate potential price impacts. If fixed price rates proposed in Section B of the model contract differ from the fixed price rates proposed in the Price Proposal, the rates in Section B will be presented to the Source Selection Authority.

In accordance with FAR 52.215-1 (f)(8), the proposed fully burdened rates in Section B will also be treated as line item prices and be analyzed in the price proposal to ensure proposed line item prices are balanced. The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable

PROGRAM INTEGRATION AND CONTROL

if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced between line items or subline items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

Phase-In - The price of the Phase-In will be evaluated and presented to the source selection authority but will not be included in the total price calculated by the Government by multiplying proposed fully burdened rates by the hours in the SPT (Section L, Template # 2 of the RFP). The government analysis of the proposed Phase-In price may result in Mission Suitability weaknesses if the proposed resources are not consistent with the proposed Phase-in Plan.

8.0 VOLUME V OTHER REQUIRED DATA

A. Ostensible Subcontractor Approach

The SEB will perform an analysis to ensure no ostensible subcontract relationship has been proposed. The SBA Ostensible Subcontracting Rule Information will be evaluated to verify the offeror is eligible for award as a small business. If it appears an ostensible subcontract may have been proposed, the proposal evaluation may proceed until a final determination is made. The Government may request additional information to analyze. Offerors are advised that evidence of non compliance with Provision L.14, SBA Ostensible Subcontractor Rule Information, or FAR 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting, may result in elimination of the Offeror from further consideration for award at any time during the procurement process.

9.0 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

[END OF SECTION]